Dramatic communication and the translation of drama

1. Introduction

On the grounds that drama is more popular than any other literary genre (taking the frequent adaptations of plays for radio and television), «very special demands are made on translators» (HAMBERG, 1969, 91). The function of the text to be translated, which is the central issue of all translation (cf. REISS/VERMEER, 1984), lies in what MOUNIN (1967, 137f.) calls stage effectiveness (cf. also REISS, 1981, 84–89). The dramatic text is therefore not primarily geared towards an individual reader, like other literary texts, but towards an audience in a theatre situation. Dramatic translation is thus «a specialized form of translation with its own rules and requirements...» (WELLWARTH, 1981, 140). The performance aspect of the dramatic text, i.e. «to operate on other levels than the strictly linguistic,» and the role of the audience as a public dimension are regarded as central considerations of the theatre translator (cf. BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, 1985, 132). Dramatic translators are hence to be regarded as professionals working on behalf of a theatre company, which presupposes a close cooperation between playwright, translator, producer/director, actor and scholar during rehearsals.[1] They are not to be mistaken for scholars doing reader-oriented academic exercises (cf. BEERBOHM, 1903, 76; GRANVILLE-BARKER, 1925, 19) that focus exclusively on the printed text. In analogy to this, translation errors will be less drastically apparent for some individual reader of the printed text than for an audience watching the play as performed on stage (cf. HAMBERG, 1969, 92).

2. Dramatic Communication

According to HESS-LÜTTICH (1985, 205) (pragma-)linguistic research into dramatic discourse has so far achieved few substantial results.[2] The first

---

1 Cf. BRAEM (1965, 122); DE BEER/TABORI (1966, 17f., 24); HAMBERG (1969, 92); WELLWARTH (1981, 141); ZUBER-SKERRITT (1984, 9).

2 It is obvious that an analysis should proceed from the macrotextual to the microtextual level, as has been suggested by SNELL-HORNBY (1986: 4). While indeed endorsed by a text-linguistics of pragma-linguistic orientation (cf. BUSSMANN 1983, 538f.), this procedure has not been applied to dramatic texts very often. The few relevant examples (cf. BURTON, 1980; SCHMACHTENBERG, 1982), though rich in data, do not sufficiently acknowledge the fact that essential to dramatic discourse is the performance situation of its staging.

comprehensive and systematic recent description of dramatic literary communication was undertaken by PFISTER (1977, 1982).[3]

In distinguishing drama from other purely literary text-types, PFISTER (1982, 24f.) conceives of it as a text designed for performance and hence making use of extra-linguistic-acoustic and optical codes. As such, he argues, it is «synesthetic» and relies on the «Plurimedialität der Textpräsentation»:[4]

> Dramatische Texte können potentiell alle Kanäle menschlicher Sinnesbereiche aktivieren; historisch realisiert wurden allerdings fast ausschliesslich Texte mit akustischen und optischen Codes, wenn man von neuesten Entwicklungen im Bereich des Happenings und des ritualistischen Theaters absieht, die auch mit haptischen Effekten – körperlicher Kontakt von Spielern und Zuschauern – und mit olfaktorischen und gustatorischen Effekten experimentieren. Das dominante akustische Zeichensystem ist meist die Sprache, daneben können aber auch aussersprachliche akustische Codes eingesetzt werden: realistisch motivierte Geräusche, konventionalisierte Klangeffekte (Glocke, Donner usw.) und Musik. Ebenso stellt sich die optische Komponente des Superzeichens «dramatischer Text» als ein strukturierter Komplex visueller Einzelcodes dar.

SCHMACHTENBERG (1982, 181), for instance, makes this explicitly clear himself: «It is demonstrated that the principles of speech theory are indeed applicable to a fictional situation so long as the application is limited to the level of interaction between fictional characters.»

3 We shall henceforth refer to PFISTER (1982).

4 Cf. also BASSNETT-MCGUIRE (1985, 94–95), who reveals the causal relation between viewing drama as a «performance text» and dealing with it as a «labyrinth of multiple codes», the linguistic code being merely «one system in a complex set of codes that interact together in performance.» Cf. also SERPIERI et al., who, in their semiotic approach to drama (1981, 164), «propose a segmentation of the dramatic text able to identify the semiological units at work in the production of meaning on stage, while respecting the sign relationship *specific* to the genre.» They are convinced «that it can make an entirely coherent contribution to both the textual and the theatrical aspects of research into drama.» M. H. SHORT (1981, 181), however, insists that a critical analysis of drama in terms of performance is impossible as the «meanings and value of each text will change not just from one production to another but also from one performance of a particular production to another.» He argues that the object of dramatic criticism should therefore be the text and not «the meanings which are said to be implied behind the words the characters speak» (1981, 180). Although we share SHORT's view that all dramatic performance is based on the reading and understanding of the concrete text and that, therefore, the text should form the basis for any critical discussion about drama, we are in favour of PFISTER's integrational perspective of drama analysis. He reminds us of the fact that the essentially performative nature of dramatic language, more significantly so than any other literary language (cf. SERPIERI et al., 1981, 167), uses deictic expressions (as implicit stage directions referring to aspects of time, space and character) to predetermine, according to the staging conventions of a period, the extra-textual world as perceptible in its spatial and temporal stage realization (cf. PFISTER, 1982, 37–39, 351–353; SERPIERI et al., 1981, 165). This notion of dramatic speech as speech act, predetermining in part its own staging and being thus indissolubly linked with aspects of scenery (visual effects), sound (acoustic effects) and the characterization of participants (kinesics, gesture, facial expression, paralinguistic features) applies regardless of the variations inherent in different performances of the same play.

> Als wichtigste sind dabei zu nennen: Statur und Physiognomie der Schauspieler, Figurengruppierungen und -bewegung (Choreographie), Mimik und Gestik, Maske, Kostüm und Requisiten, Bühnenform, Bühnenbild und Beleuchtung. Was wir hier in additiver Reihung aufgezählt haben, ist im dramatischen Text als System interdependenter Strukturelemente zum Superzeichen integriert. (1982, 25f.)

If we compare traditional dramatic and traditional narrative texts,[5] we note that in narrative speech information is not transferred via the various channels of perception but via a narrator who is explicitly manifest in the text, acting as a mediating agent between the author and the reader, who, in turn, is explicitly addressed in the text. This implies that whereas in drama verbal utterances are confined to the monological or dialogical speech of the figures, in the novel they extend to those of the narrator, who comments on or introduces the replies of the characters. This marked contrast between the communicative situation in traditional dramatic and narrative speech is established by the absence in drama of a mediating communication system and the unmediated combination of the inner and outer communication system (cf. 1982, 22). We can therefore say that for drama

> the dialogue between . . . [the] fictional characters is embedded in the (unidirectional) communication process between an empirical author . . . and the people . . . he anticipates to read (or watch) the dialogue of the work he created. (HESS-LÜTTICH, 1985, 200)

This relationship may be rendered by the following notation (cf. esp. PFISTER, 1982, 21; also FIEGUTH, 1973, 186; SEGRE, 1981, 96; HESS-LÜTTICH, 1985, 200):

$$S_4 \rightarrow \{S_3 \rightarrow (S_2) \rightarrow [S/R_1 \leftrightarrow S/R_1] \rightarrow (R_2) \rightarrow R_3\} \rightarrow R_4$$

This model is constituted by the semiotic relations between the various dialectically opposed positions of sender and receiver. The first level is composed of the communicative relationship between S_4 and R_4, the former being a «specific author with his or her socio-cultural background and psycho-cognitive set-up» (HESS-LÜTTICH, 1985, 200), the latter a specific recipient. The second level is made up of the relation S_3-R_3 and refers to the «ideal» and essentially fictitious author as implied in the text «in his social role as producer of the entire text» (1985, 200) and the «ideal» recipient as implied in the text representing his or her equally fictitious

---

5 «Traditional» here relates to the prototypes of either literary form: non-epic drama and non-personal narrative situation. Concrete realizations of «non-traditional» (i.e. deviant) texts will be seen against the norm set up by the canon of «traditional» texts (for more details, cf. PFISTER, 1982, 21f.).

counterpart. The positions S_2 and R_2 are not occupied in dramatic texts due to the absence of a mediating semiotic level (cf. PFISTER, 1982, 21). The third level is held by S_1 and R_1, «i.e. the fictional participants of the dialogue represented in the text in their communicative roles as speaker and hearer (...)» (1985, 200).

The distinctions to be made between the inner and outer communication system can be summarized thus: the inner communication system refers to the dialogue between the dramatic figures (level S_1-R_1); the outer communication system to the communication taking place between the author and the recipients (levels S_3-R_3 and S_4-R_4); communication between two dramatic figures is bidirectional ($S_1 \rightarrow R_1 \rightarrow S_1$); communication between author and recipient is unidirectional ($S_3/S_4 \rightarrow R_3/R_4$);[6] information can explicitly be transferred from the inner to the outer communication system ($S_1 \rightarrow R_3/R_4$), but not vice versa.

Where $S_1 \rightarrow R_3/R_4$ applies the essentially prototypical communication model of dramatic discourse is infringed and we may speak of an alienation effect, to use Brechtian terminology, or an unexpected breach of the norm.[7]

In analogy to Karl Bühler's triadic functional model of language, REISS (1981, 78, 86–89) and REISS/VERMEER (1984, 211) describe dramatic texts as a mixed form of text-type combining informative, expressive and operative textual elements. So apart from being «multi-medial», drama is also multi-functional. Yet, as Bühler's model does not do justice to the complexities of language (cf. PFISTER, 1982, 152), we shall henceforth rely on the language model proposed by Roman JAKOBSON (1960). JAKOBSON differentiates between six distinct communicative functions of language which he allocates each to one of the positions in the model: to the sender the expressive or emotive function of characterizing his/her attitude towards the object of speech, to the recipient the conative function of persuading him/her,

---

6 We agree with HESS-LÜTTICH (1985, 201f.) that «The semantic basis of this model defining discourse as A *informing* B (A → B) does not, however, account for the complex interdependent relationship of expression and perception, knowledge and prognosis, intention and anticipation, reflexivity and complementary role systems, (...) restricting the description to the surface of the ‚black box‘ of communication while, in an interpretative perspective of discourse analysis, the predicate of the type ‚A communicates with B' denotes both a *reflexive* relation (with respect to the feed-back-system as a condition of communication) and a symmetrical relation (in the sense of the premise that *if* A communicates with B *then* B communicates with A), but not as a transitive relation as the model suggests ...»
It is for lack of an integrated analytical model of dramatic discourse, however, that we adhere to PFISTER's unidirectional communication model for drama.

7 Such «epic» effects are created e.g. by «asides», monologues *ad spectatores,* and comments by a choir (cf. Greek Classical drama), etc. Cf. DE BEAUGRANDE (1978, 19) and LEECH/SHORT (1981, 28, 139) who, in analogy to MUKAROVSKY, use the term «foregrounding» to describe the breaching of language norms. Cf. also footnote 8.

to the speech-content the referential function of presenting the object of speech, to the message «als dem sprachlichen Superzeichen» (PFISTER, 1982, 152) the poetic function of reflecting the structure of the language sign itself,[8] to the channel the phatic function of achieving and maintaining the communicative contact between sender and recipient, and to the code the metalinguistic function «der Thematisierung und Bewusstbarmachung des Codes» (1982, 152). It is particularly for dramatic and ordinary speech that the restrictions of the triadic language model become apparent. Phatic communion, for instance, which is very typical of everyday communication and indeed of modern dramatic dialogue (cf. BECKETT's and PINTER's characters), lies outside its scope.

Governed by the principle of «polyfunctionality», dramatic speech always serves several functions simultaneously, one specific function being dominant. In terms of the two communication systems within which dramatic discourse occurs it is essential to note that the language functions at work in both systems need not necessarily overlap. Other than the criterion of multi-medial text production, multi-functionality is thus no distinct feature to differentiate dramatic from everyday speech: «[Die] Differenzqualitäten sind vielmehr ... die Überlagerung von innerem und äusserem Kommunikationssystem und die dabei auftretenden Funktionsverschiebungen» (1982, 168).[9]

If compared to the functional correlations in narrative speech, the referential function seems to be less frequent in both dramatic and everyday speech:

> (...) the spoken word in real life (and, to some extent on the stage) derives much of its significance from the context of situation, the relation of language to all those extralinguistic features which, in a novel, must be rendered consciously and explicitly (...) by linguistic means. (...) fictional dialogue is likely to be more heavily burdened with informative and suggestive detail than the speech of everyday life, though this burden is also shared by non-dialogue elements. (N. Page, quot. in PFISTER, 1982, 168)

In both drama and everyday speech, intratextual information gaps can therefore be compensated by the various extralinguistic components of the

---

8 Cf. also LEECH/SHORT (1981, 28) who point out that «The Prague School of poetics [esp. MUKAROVSKY] has distinguished the ‚poetic function' of language by its FOREGROUND-ING or DE-AUTOMATIZIATION of the linguistic code.» As such, it is constitutive of what LEECH/SHORT define as style (cf. 3.).

9 BURTON (1980, 178f.) for instance, in distinguishing between microcosm as the fictional world of the play and macrocosm as the real world of theatre, identifies twelve possible functional emphases: each of JAKOBSON's six language functions may be dominant in either communication system.

actual speech event (e.g. the speaker's non-verbal activities within a given spatial/temporal setting).

Taking dialogue as the basic mode of dramatic discourse (cf. 1982, 23f.) and presupposing for it the identity of speech and action (as the unmarked form of dramatic discourse [cf. 1982, 169]), we must view dialogue as «gesprochene Handlung» (1982, 24):

> Wenn sich im dramatischen Dialog sprechend Handlung vollzieht, geht die einzelne dramatische Replik nicht in ihrem propositionalen Aussagegehalt auf, sondern stellt darüber hinaus den Vollzug eines Aktes – eines Versprechens, einer Drohung, einer Überredung usw. – dar. (1982, 24)

Inherent to dramatic speech is thus a performative quality that is also particular to a great deal of everyday verbal interaction. Dramatic speech will then have to be viewed as a speech act (cf. SCHMACHTENBERG, 1982) which is at the same time situation-bound and constitutive of a situation. In other words, a dialogue being initiated by a particular situation creates another situation (e.g. in terms of a different character-grouping) which, in turn, leads to a another dialogue.[10] In essence, stage-action is thus made to progress. «[Die] Identität von Rede und intentional situationsverändernder Handlung» can therefore be posited as the prototype of dramatic communication, against which other forms, e.g. non-identity of speech and action, can be measured (cf. 1982: 169–171).

Related to this performative aspect of dramatic speech is the fact that in drama the conative/«appellative» language function tends to be dominant:

> In solchen Formen dramatischer Rede, in denen die appellative Funktion dominiert, wird der allgemein geltende Handlungscharakter dramatischer Rede ... besonders evident: Umstimmung und Befehl stellen Sprechakte dar, und unabhängig davon, ob der Umstimmungsversuch glückt oder nicht und ob dem Befehl Folge geleistet wird oder nicht, wird durch sie handelnd die Situation verändert ... Es wundert daher nicht, (...) dass Überredungs- und Umstimmungsdialoge über weite Perioden der Dramengeschichte hinweg fast obligate Bauelemente darstellen. (1985, 158)

The conative function is probably the most essential language function in the inner communication system of dramatic discourse. It does not, however, apply to the outer communication system as a rule:

---

10 In narrative texts, by contrast, it is the narrator's report that constitutes the fictitious communication situation (cf. PFISTER, 1982, 24).

Die Appellfunktion des dramatischen Textes an den Rezipienten erscheint vielmehr im Vergleich zu expositorischen oder narrativen Texten meist zurückgenommen, wenn man von Lehrstücken oder Thesendramen absieht, in denen dann aber der direkte Appell an das Publikum bezeichnenderweise häufig die Etablierung eines vermittelnden Kommunikationssystems durch epische Kommentatorfiguren oder Figuren als «Sprachrohre» des Autors bedingt. Dieser Aspekt lässt sich jedoch keineswegs zu einer Gattungskonstante generalisieren, sondern erfährt historisch und typologisch äusserst vielfältige Ausprägungen. Sie reichen von einer Dramaturgie der Objektivität (etwa im Naturalismus), die dem Zuschauer nur Fakten zuspielen will und auf eindeutige Appelle verzichtet, bis zu einer Dramaturgie der engagierten Parteilichkeit, die einen ideologisch eindeutigen Appell ausformuliert, und von Texten, die sich allein an das Amüsierbedürfnis des Rezipienten wenden, bis zu solchen, die ihn mit ethischen Problemen konfrontieren. (1982, 160f.)

Whereas the conative language function is almost always dominant in the inner communication system, relating to the performative quality of dramatic dialogue, the expressive function is usually dominant in the outer communication system, relating to its descriptive quality of implicitly characterizing the dramatic figure:

Die expressive Funktion des Ausdrucks, die auf den Sprecher einer Replik zurückverweist, ist vor allem im äusseren Kommunkationssystem ständig von grosser Bedeutung, da die Konkretisierung einer Figur durch die Wahl ihrer Redegegenstände, durch ihr sprachliches Verhalten und durch ihren Sprachstil zu den wichtigsten Techniken der Figurencharakterisierung im Drama gehört ... (1982, 156)

This technique of characterization draws on idiolectal, sociolectal and dialectal idiosyncrasies of speech and on aspects relating to register and stylistic texture (cf. 1982, 252).

Of less permanent significance are cases of dramatic speech with the expressive function being dominant in the inner communication system. PFISTER (1982, 157f.) gives as examples short exclamations (usually elliptic) and soliloquies, which neither refer to things outside the conscience of the speaker, nor are intended to persuade the hearer or maintain the communicative contact (cf. 1982, 156), but serve the sole purpose of expressing the speaker's attitude towards the situation he is in (exclamation) or towards himself (soliloquy). That in the latter case he is not only the subject but also the object of his speech is made explicit by his frequently using the deictic (i.e. first person pronoun) *I*.[11]

11 For a discussion of deixis in relation to dramatic discourse, cf. SERPIERI et al. (1981).

3. Relevant Criteria for the Translation of Drama

In accordance with the specific nature of dramatic communication, we shall now devise a set of components as relevant to stage translation.

To start with, we shall concentrate on the linguistic component, i.e. the semantic and stylistic properties of dialogue as pertinent to the inner and outer communication system of dramatic discourse.

According to WELLWARTH (1981, 142), «The first principle of play translation is style. (...) style is that which causes a play to sound as if it had originally been written in the target language.» The degree of stylization[12] has been determined as of primary significance in a translation of dramatic speech (cf. LEVY, 1969, 133–137). SNELL-HORNBY (1984, 4) for instance shows that dialogue in modern plays, despite its apparent affinity to everyday discourse, must still be regarded as «Kunstsprache, als Sonderform der gesprochenen Sprache, zum Sprechen, geschrieben, jedoch mit der normalen gesprochenen Sprache niemals identisch».

LEECH/SHORT (1981, 139) distinguish between two views of style, which, however, are mutually supporting. The one applies to the level of *parole* and is «the quantiative foregrounding ... of a prominent pattern of choices within the code,» and the other to the level of *langue,* being «the qualitative foregrounding ... which changes the code itself»:[13]

> Whereas the «stylistic variants» model locates stylistic effect against a background of other equivalent variants, the [qualitative] foregrounding model locates stylistic effect against a background of more normal or expected expressions which could have occurred. Each model, in its own way, provides a standard for comparing choices, so that the differences of a writer's style can be registered. (1981, 139)

It is the translator's task to determine that degree of stylization in the translation. Further criteria to be noted in drama translation are rhetorical figures, syntactic ambiguities (cf. GREINER, 1987, 52) and semantic complexity (cf. LEVY, 1969, 137–141). The latter is of particular importance if the replies are constituted of deictic units referring to spatial or temporal elements within the stage area, or if their communicative functions differ from one dramatic figure to another. It is obvious that on an outer communicative level, i.e. from the perspective of the audience, the semantic content of the dialogue takes yet another dimension, whose relevance in

---

12 Note PFISTER's (1982, 150f.) use of «Abweichung» to describe the same phenomenon. In: GREINER (1987, 52) it is «stilistische Verfremdung».

13 LEECH/SHORT (1981, 29) also use the terms «transparent» vs. «opaque» to differentiate between the two concepts of style.

terms of stage effectiveness must be considered by the translator. This aspect of semantic complexity is especially important where the text makes extensive use of dramatic irony (cf. 1969, 139f. on *Macbeth*) in order to create tension and to heighten the play's expressive power.

The degree of stylization is also important for the way in which the second component of stage-effective translation is realized. This component is to view dialogue as spoken action, each linguistic utterance being regarded as performing a speech-act. If compared to the dialogue in classical drama, which is characterized by the primacy of the word, modern dialogue is characterized by the primacy of action in situation (cf. ANDRIC, 1967, 80):

> Da der Dialog Worthandlung ist, geht es bei der Übersetzung auch um die Beibehaltung der Willensintensität, mit der die Gestalt an den Gegenspieler appelliert, um ihn zu irgendeiner Aktion zu bewegen. (1967, 143)

This potential antagonism between the *I* and the *you,* which on stage is also expressed by mime, gesture and paralinguistic features such as tempo, rhythm, intonation, and pauses, should already become apparent on a syntactic level.

> In einem *wirklichen* Gespräch kann eine Gestalt einen vollkommen normal gebauten Satz zögernd, stotternd, affektiert vorbringen, der Dramatiker [and thus also the translator] aber sollte den Satz so gestalten, dass diese expressiven Werte allein durch die Konstruktion angedeutet werden und er das Zögern, Stottern und die Affektiertheit *bezeichnet.* (1967, 141)

It is the deictic textual units that determine this relationship between the text's necessary and sufficient degree of explicitness and the extratextual-situational aspects of dramatic action. The translator, consequently, must not overdifferentiate the syntactic-semantic textual component, compensating its apparent lack of emotional potential by verbal means. Rather, he should find formulations which correlate with the expressive potential already provided by extratextual means. The deictic units thus indicate the direction in which the translation should be done, reflecting the way in which the various conflicting actions between characters are to be performed through dialogue. In terms of language functions this means that the translator must pay special attention to translating the conative/ «appellative» function, which is usually dominant in the inner communicative system.

The concept of rhythmic progression is another important aspect of spoken dramatic action that should be accounted for by a translator (cf. SNELL-HORNBY, 1984, 7). Factors determining the temporal sequence of

the individual textual elements are scenic alterations (spatial or temporal shifts or changes of stage setting), variation between modes of discourse (dialogical vs. monological), variation between degrees of stylization (e.g. prose vs. verse), sentence rhythm (i.e. accentuation of natural speech or prosodic features of verse). Opposed to these progressive features are those elements of speech which are not conducive to what Pfister (1982, 169, 170) calls «intentional situationsverändernde Handlung» (cf. also 1982, 376). Such elements are pauses, or silences, occurring between utterances, and repetitions (recurring structural or thematic elements) emphasizing the static-durative aspects of dramatic action.[14] It is not surprising that in modern drama (cf. esp. Pinter and Beckett), where common themes are life's monotonous routine and man's lack of existential perspective, static elements prevail over progressive ones, thus reflecting the determining factors of the *conditio humana* (cf. 1982, 349). It is essential, therefore, that the translator adheres to the overall rhythmic pattern of the original in order to faithfully render the specific correlation of form and content. It goes without saying that the translator must also keep an eye on the length of speeches, as indeed on the overall duration of the play, if he wants to recreate the original's dramatic effect. Carlson, who views duration in a stage speech as part of its meaning, points out that translations tend to be longer than their originals:

> A play that runs two hours in the original French version might run two and three-quarter hours, or even longer, in English. If duration is part of the meaning, then the audience receives a distorted view of the artist's vision. (1964, 56)

To Bassnett-McGuire (cf. 1985, 89) it is this «time-bound» nature of the theatre text, distinguishing it from prose and poetry, which causes the problem of form to merge with the question of speech rhythm:

> In the case of a verse drama, for example, the translator may take care to foreground metrical features, but in the case of naturalist dialogue, the translator will opt for naturalistic speech rhythms in the TL ... (1985, 89)

The translator will then have to carry out the process of binding together the tempo-rhythms of speech, gesture, kinesic movement and scenic change in such a way as to bring out, particularly in moments of great dramatic crisis, the «delicately balanced tension between words and action» (Bassnett-McGuire, 1978, 171).

---

14 Pfister (1982, 270f.) uses the term «Geschehen» instead of «Handlung» for non-progressive action.

A third criterion relevant to stage translation has to do with the problem of speech duration. CARLSON (1964, 56) identifies it as «the problem of the kinds of words to be placed at the actor's disposal.» Most other theorists refer to it as the issue of «speakability» or «playability» as against the mere readability of the written text.[15] HAAG (1984, 221f.) even speaks of «Atembarkeit» as bound up with the rhythmical flow of the speaker's emotions. This criterion is essential in enabling the actor to make himself understood in a concrete staging situation and creating a fictitious character that is credible in a given stage world (cf. SNELL-HORNBY, 1984, 8). The «words to be placed at the actor's disposal» are thus instrumental in characterizing the dramatic figure he is impersonating. A translator would consequently want to recreate a character's speech in terms of those syntactic and stylistic features that are characteristic of his psychological disposition. In PFISTER's terms (cf. 1982, 259f.), he would have to apply the technique of implicit self-characterization in order to render the expressive function of the speaker's utterance, which in this case is dominant in the outer communication system. Relevant such aspects of speech are dialectal usage, register and idiomatic style, bringing to light the psychological realities of the characters and the socio-cultural context in which they act. BASSNETT-MCGUIRE concludes that if there is a gestural understructure discernible in the dramatic text – and this is what ultimately makes the original text speakable and actable –

> then there is a way of deciphering it and therefore of translating it, and so far one of the most hopeful lines of enguiry seems to be that of the deictic units. Since deictic units determine the interaction between the characters on stage, they also determine characterization ... (1985, 98)

Entrance lines and exits are particularly important for characterization, especially for small parts, as it is the first and last replies of characters to make a lasting and usually indelible impression on the recipients (cf. LEVY, 1969, 157; HAMBERG, 1969, 94).

While insisting that the deixis of dramatic language is a crucial factor in any theatre translation, BASSNETT-MCGUIRE relativizes its viability for a general translation strategy:

---

15 Cf. BEERBOHM (1903, 76); BRAEM (1965, 102); BRENNER-RADEMACHER (1965, 8); HARTUNG (1965, 10); GORJAN (1965); BEER/TABORI (1966, 27, 40); MOUNIN (1967, 137f.); KLOEPFER (1967, 86); LEVY (1969, 128ff.), URBAN (1972, 29f.); WELLWARTH (1981, 140); BASSNETT-MCGUIRE (1980, 122); KAEMMERLING (1983, 453f., 457); ZUBER-SKERRITT (1984, 1); HAAG (1984), SNELL-HORNBY (1984, 7f.).

> ... it would be far too simplistic to suggest that «faithful» adherence to the deictic units of the SL text in translation could solve the problems of the translation of written theatre language. ... what is crucial about the deictic units is not their specific presence per se but their function in the text. (1985, 101)

So here too, the translation strategy to be chosen (cf. HÖNIG/KUSSMAUL's (1982) distinction between *Funktionskonstanz* and *Funktionsverschiedenheit*) ultimately hinges on extra-contextual factors impinging on the translator's text.

These factors may be subsumed under the fourth component to be considered in translating for the stage: the role of the audience. Translating the emotional world of a character thus also entails the translator's task of moving the audience. This is only possible where the translation is the «*recreation* of the original language's meaning ... in the socially accepted style of the target language,» which will have to be done by «a person steeped in both cultures» (WELLWARTH, 1981, 142). Effecting an audience response – in comedy this would be laughter at a comic figure, a surprising turn in the action, or a play on words; in tragedy emapthy for the tragic hero – is thus dependent upon the spectators' acceptance of and sympathy for the production. Concrete parameters affecting the reception of a play in translation, while being measured against the «sozial und kulturell bedingten Erwartungshorizont» of an audience (SNELL-HORNBY, 1984, 8), are the verbal styles and the various styles of acting. It is obvious that the literary and theatrical tradition of the target culture on the one hand and the changing taste of theatregoers on the other are crucial in determining the degree of audience expectation and tolerance (cf. MOUNIN, 1967, 135f.; LEVY, 1969, 137; BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, 1978, 161ff.). FOTHERINGHAM, in pinpointing «some of the dimensions and complexities of theatrical communication» (ZUBER-SKERRITT, 1984, 37) goes as far as to argue that audience expectation creates new theatrical meaning in the sense that

> the meaning of any play is modified by the structure of the audience ... Not only are audiences aware of the paradigm of types of which they are one, they are also supremely aware of anyone who shouldn't be there. (1984, 37)

This essentially bidirectional view of theatrical communication is also made plausible by the fact that

> the encoded message of the play is impotent ... in those situations in which other, stronger codes are at work; principally orthodox theatre buildings, hierarchical social groupings, and commercial financial structures. (1984, 35)

These sorts of constraints may impinge on a translator's work if he or she is translating theatre of ideas for use in commercial theatre (cf. BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, 1985, 92f.) or, more likely now, for television, «subverting a play's encoded meaning and style in order to make it fit into a desired paradigm of entertainment» (ZUBER-SKERITT, 1984, 33).

This notion of theatre performances of the same play being subject to alterations according to audience reception creates «a special need for the continued retranslation or updating of theatre texts, where patterns of speech are in a continuous process of change» (BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, 1985, 89).

As a theatre text's ephemity does not only affect its translation for the foreign stage but also its transposition on to the home stage (cf. ZUBER-SKERRITT, 1984), one can generally posit its instability and datedness for stage production and the individual theatrical performances. As BASSNETT-MCGUIRE (1980, 120; 1985, 87) points out, theatre text and performance are inextricably intermeshed in a dialectical relationship, which is the consequential result of the bidirectional communicative interaction taking place between the author of the play text and the audience. PFISTER's model of dramatic communiation, which describes an unidirectional flow of information, would thus have to be adjusted in terms of an exchange of information between sender and recipient.

Under 2. we argued that the study of dramatic translation should be based on a discussion of extratextual aspects of performance.[16] Despite the fact that these aspects are relevant to the translator's understanding of the performative nature of dramatic language, we regard his basic task as consisting in what BASSNETT-MCGUIRE (1985, 91) calls the producing of «a basic *scenario* that is then worked on by the [theatre] company.» The translator is thus to take that part of the job which can best be defined in terms of objectifiable criteria, leaving the aspect of «performability» to the director and/or actors who are to present the work. BASSNETT-MCGUIRE provides the following arguments in support of her favoured strategy of co-operative translation:

> It seems to me that the time has come ... to focus more closely on the linguistic structures of the text itself. For, after all, it is only within the written that the performable can be encoded and there are infinite performance decodings possible in any play-text. The writrten text, *troué* [i.e. incomplete] though it may be, is the raw material on which the translator has to work and it is with the written text, rather than with a hypothetical performance, that the translator must begin. (1985, 102)

16 Cf. footnote 4.

Once a translator has established all theatre-bound inroads on the dramatic text,[17] a text-oriented approach will not fail to trace those performative elements which, at least to a certain extent, are inscribed in the text and which are thus allusive of the special nature of dramatic discourse.

University of Zürich   MARKUS WEBER
Nordstrasse 16
CH-8006 Zürich

4. References

ANDRIC, Dragoslav (1967): «Das Übersetzen moderner Bühnenwerke und einige Ansichten über das schöpferische Übersetzen im allgemeinen.» In: I. J. CITROEN (ed.). *Ten Years of Translation. Proceedings of the Fourth Congress of the International Federation of Translators (FIT) Dubrovnik 1963.* Oxford, 79–82.

BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, Susan (1978): «Translating Spatial Poetry: an Examination of Theatre Texts in Performance.» In: James S. HOLMES et al. (eds.). *Literature and Translation.* Leuven: Acco, 161–176.

– (1980): *Translation Studies.* London: Methuen.

– (1985): «Ways Through the Labyrinth. Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts.» In: Theo HERMANS (ed.). *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation.* London & Sidney: Croom Helm, 87–102.

DE BEAUGRANDE, Robert (1978): *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating.* Assen: Van Gorcum.

DE BEER, J.; TABORI, P. (eds.) (1966): «Translation and the Theatre: A Report of a Round-Table Discussion of P.E.N., Reims 1963.» *Arena 25,* 1–107.

BEERBOHM, Max (1903): «Translation of Play.» *Saturday Review 96,* 75–76.

BRAEM, Helmut (1965): «Bühnenübersetzer und Theaterleute.» *Babel 11,* 102.

BRENNER-RADEMACHER, Susanne (1965): «Übersetzer sprachen mit Bühnenkünstlern.» *Babel 11,* 8–9.

BURTON, Deirdre (1980): *Dialogue and Discourse. A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

BUSSMANN, Hadumod (1983): *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft.* Stuttgart: Kröner.

CARLSON, H. G. (1964): «Problems in Play Translation.» *Educational Theatre Journal 16,* 55–58.

FIEGUTH, Rolf (1973): «Zur Rezeptionslenkung bei narrativen und dramatischen Werken.» *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter 45,* 186–201.

GORJAN, Zlatko (1965): «Über das akustische Element beim Übersetzen von Bühnenwerken.» In: Rolf ITALIAANDER (ed.). *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965.* Frankfurt/Main: Athenäum, 88–89.

GRANVILLE-BARKER, Harley (1925): «On Translating Plays.» *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature.* New Series (=Essays of divers hands) 5, 19–42.

17 Useful suggestions for performance-oriented studies of drama translation are made in ZUBER-SKERRITT (1984, 3–11).

GREINER, Norbert (1987): «Sprechrhythmus und Sprechbarkeit als Mittel der Figurenkonstitution: zu einem Problem der Übersetzung von Bühnensprache (am Beispiel des *Hamlet*).» In: W. KÜHLWEIN (ed.). *Perspektiven der Angewandten Linguistik.* Tübingen: Narr, 51–53.

HAAG, Ansgar (1984): «Übersetzen fürs Theater: Beispiel William Shakespeare.» *Babel 30,* 218–224.

HAMBERG, Lars (1969): «Some Practical Considerations Concerning Dramatic Translation.» *Babel 15,* 91–94; 100.

HARTUNG, Ernst A. (1965): «Was erwarten Theaterleute von einer Bühnenübersetzung?» *Babel 11,* 10–11.

HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. (1985): «Dramatic Discourse.» In: Teun A. VAN DIJK (ed.). *Discourse and Literature.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 199–214.

HÖNIG, Hans G. & Paul KUSSMAUL (1984): *Strategie der Übersetzung. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Narr.

HOFMANN, Norbert (1980): *Redundanz und Äquivalenz in der literarischen Übersetzung, dargestellt an fünf deutschen Übersetzungen des* Hamlet. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

JAKOBSON, Roman (1960): «Linguistics and Poetics.» In: T. A. SEBEOK (ed.). *Style in Language.* Cambridge/Mass.: MIT Press, 350–377.

KAEMMERLING, E. (1983): «Der kalkulierte Dialog. Poetische Komplexität und semiotische Analyse eines Dramendialogs am Beispiel von Samuel Becketts ‚Come and Go‘.» Diss. Technische Universität Berlin, 8–29; 453–472.

KLOEPFER, Rolf (1967): *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. Romanisch-Deutscher Sprachbereich.* München: Fink.

LEECH, Geoffrey N. & Michael H. SHORT (1981): *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose.* London: Longman.

LEVY, Jiri (1969): *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung.* Trans. from Czech Umeni prekladu by Walter Schamschula. Frankfurt: Athenäum.

MOUNIN, Georges (1967): *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung.* Trans. from Ital. *Teoria e Storia della Traduzione* by Harro Stammerjohann. München: Nymphenburg.

PFISTER, Manfred (1982): *Das Drama.* UTB. München: Fink.

REISS, Katharina (1981): «Textbestimmung und Textmethode.» In: Wolfram WILSS (ed.). *Übersetzungswissenschaft.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 76–91.

– VERMEER, Hans J. (1984): *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

SCHMACHTENBERG, Reinhard (1982): *Sprechakttheorie und dramatischer Dialog: Ein Methodenansatz zur Drameninterpretation.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

SEGRE, Cesare (1981): «Narratology and Theater.» *Poetics Today 2.3,* 95–104.

SERPIERI, Alessandro et al. (1981): «Toward a Segmentation of the Dramatic Text.» *Poetics Today 2.3,* 163–200.

SHORT, Michael H. 1981. «Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama.» *Applied Linguistics. 2,* 180–202.

SNELL-HORNBY, Mary (1984): «Sprechbare Sprache – Spielbarer Text. Zur Problematik der Bühnenübersetzung.» In: R. WATTS and U. WEIDMANN (eds.). *Modes of Interpretation. Essays Presented to Ernst Leisi.* Tübingen: Narr, 101–116.

– (1986a): «Translation as a Cross-cultural Event: *Midnight's Children – Mitternachtskinder.* Unpubl. paper.

– (1986b): «Übersetzen, Sprache, Kultur.» In: M. SNELL-HORNBY (ed.). *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis.* Tübingen: Francke, 9–29.

TOPHOVEN, Elmar (1976): «Von *Fin de partie* zu *Endspiel.* Arbeitsbericht des Übersetzers.» In: *Materialien zu Becketts* Endspiel. *Berichte und Aufsätze.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 118–127.

URBAN, Peter (1972): «Cechov übersetzen.» *Theater heute 5,* 29–33.

WELLWARTH, George E. (1981): «Special Considerations in Drama Translation.» In: M. G. ROSE (ed.). *Translation Spectrum*. Albany: State University of N. Y. Press, 140–146.

ZUBER-SKERRITT, Ortrun (ed.) (1984): *Page to Stage: Theatre as Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.